

Application No. 09/874,593
Response to Office Action

Customer No. 01933

R E M A R K S

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

THE CLAIMS

Claim 2 has been amended to be rewritten in independent form, as well as to more clearly recite the feature of the present invention whereby the imaging condition detection means detects the imaging condition based on information relating to the imaging condition, and the information relating to the imaging condition is added to the image data of the captured image.

In addition, claim 6 has been amended to depend from claim 2, and claims 6-8 have been amended to correct some minor informalities of which the undersigned has become aware so as to put them in better U.S. form.

No new matter has been added, and it is respectfully requested that the amendments to the claims be approved and entered.

THE PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by USP 6,683,981 ("Matama"); claims 5-8 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being anticipated by USP 6,317,156

Application No. 09/874,593
Response to Office Action

Customer No. 01933

("Nagasaki et al")¹; and claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in view of the combination of Matama and USP 6,259,825 ("Yamazaki"). These rejection, however, are respectfully traversed.

According to the present invention as recited in amended independent claim 2, a printer apparatus for printing an image based on image data of a captured image is provided. The apparatus comprises: imaging condition detection means for detecting an imaging condition of the captured image; pre-print process means for performing a pre-print process for the image data of the captured image in accordance with the imaging condition; and print means for printing the image based on the image data processed by the pre-print process means. And according to the present invention as recited in amended independent claim 2, the imaging condition detection means detects the imaging condition based on information relating to the imaging condition, and the information relating to the imaging condition is added to the image data of the captured image.

That is, as shown for example in Figs. 3 and 4, the printer apparatus reads, for example, header information that is added to

¹ It is respectfully pointed out that since claims 6 and 7 respectively depended from claims 1 and 3, which were not rejected in view of Nagasaki, claims 6 and 7 should not have been rejected as being anticipated by Nagasaki.

Application No. 09/874,593
Response to Office Action

Customer No. 01933

the captured image data. Based on the analysis of the image data, the imaging condition detection means detects an imaging condition of the captured image. For example, the imaging condition detection means determines the zoom amount used while capturing the image, or an ISO sensitivity used for the captured image. Pre-print process means performs a pre-print process (for example, noise reduction or further zooming at the printing apparatus) for the image data of the captured image in accordance with the imaging condition. And the image is printed based on the image data processed by the pre-print process means.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Matama discloses at column 8, lines 25-41 thereof that an condition of the captured image is detected based on information added to the image data of the captured image.

It is respectfully submitted, however, that according to Matama the condition setting section 48 only reads the prescanned image data from the prescan memory 40. That is, Matama discloses that based on the image data, the condition setting section 48 constructs density histograms, and calculates average image density, large-area transmission density, and highlights and shadows. And it is respectfully submitted that Matama merely discloses analyzing prescanned image data to determine conditions for processing the image data, which determined conditions are then performed by the image processing subsection 50.

Application No. 09/874,593
Response to Office Action

Customer No. 01933

It is respectfully submitted that none of the functions of the condition setting section 48 disclosed by Matama relate to detecting an imaging condition of the captured image based on information added to the image data of the captured image (for example, header data), as recited in amended independent claim 2.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the present invention as recited in amended independent claim 2, and claim 6 depending therefrom clearly patentably distinguishes over Matama, under 35 USC 102 as well as under 35 USC 103.

According to the present invention as recited in independent claim 3, moreover, a printer apparatus is provided which comprises: imaging sensitivity detection means for detecting an imaging sensitivity used for the captured image; noise removal process means for performing a noise removal process for the image data of the captured image prior to the printing; and control means for controlling the noise removal process means in accordance with the imaging sensitivity.

Thus, as shown in Fig. 4, for example, according to the present invention as recited in independent claim 3, the imaging sensitivity detection means detects the imaging sensitivity used for the captured image as, for example, a normal ISO sensitivity, an ISO sensitivity increased by one level, or an ISO sensitivity increased by more than one level. Based on the detected ISO sensitivity, noise removal is performed.

Application No. 09/874,593
Response to Office Action

Customer No. 01933

On page of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Matama discloses detecting an imaging sensitivity used for a captured image at column 8, lines 25-41.

It is respectfully pointed out, however, that the cited portion of Matama does not even mention detecting an image sensitivity used for a captured image.

The Examiner acknowledges on page 5 of the Office Action that Matama does not disclose a noise removal process or control means for controlling a noise removal process in accordance with imaging sensitivity. For this reason, the Examiner has cited Yamazaki to supply the missing teachings of Matama.

It is respectfully pointed out, however, that Yamazaki merely discloses subjecting a prescanned image to two resolution transformations: a first resolution transformation that does not include noise reduction, for producing an image with a high resolution; and a second resolution transformation that does include noise reduction and that produces an image having a medium or low resolution.

It is respectfully submitted that Yamazaki does not disclose, teach or even remotely suggest controlling the noise reduction based on a detected imaging sensitivity, in the manner recited in amended independent claim 3.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the present invention as recited in independent claim 3, and claims 4 and 7

Application No. 09/874,593
Response to Office Action

Customer No. 01933

depending therefrom clearly patentably distinguishes over Matama and Yamazaki, taken singly or in combination, under 35 USC 103.

According to the present invention as recited in independent claim 5, moreover, a printer apparatus is provided which comprises: imaging zoom detection means for detecting a condition of use of an imaging zoom used for the captured image; print zoom means for enlarging an image to be printed on a print film; and control means for limiting a magnification of the image to be printed on the print film, in accordance with the condition of use of the imaging zoom.

Thus, as shown in Fig. 3, for example, according to the present invention as recited in independent claim 5, the imaging zoom detection means determines whether the captured image was captured using the imaging zoom function, and if the zoom function was used, whether the zoom condition was (for example) 2x or 3x. Based on the determined condition of use of the imaging zoom, the control means limits the magnification of the image to be printed on the print film. That is, as shown in Figs. 3 and 5, for example, the print zoom is controlled based on the imaging zoom such that the product of the imaging zoom and the print zoom is less than 6x.

On pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Nagasaki et al discloses all of the features recited in claim 5 at column 5, lines 9-17 and 49-58 thereof.

Application No. 09/874,593
Response to Office Action

Customer No. 01933

It is respectfully submitted, however, that the cited portion of Nagasaki et al merely relates to print zoom, and does not disclose, teach or suggest imaging zoom detection means for detecting a condition of use of an imaging zoom used for the captured image; or control means for limiting a magnification of the image to be printed on the print film, in accordance with the condition of use of the imaging zoom, as recited in independent claim 5.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the present invention as recited in independent claim 5, and claim 8 depending therefrom clearly patentably distinguishes over Nagasaki et al, under 35 USC 102 as well as under 35 USC 103.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention as recited in each of independent claims 2, 3 and 5, as well as claims 4 and 6-8 respectively depending therefrom, clearly patentably distinguishes over Matama, Nagasaki et al and Yamazaki, taken singly or in any combination, under 35 USC 102 as well as under 35 USC 103.

RE: THE PRIORITY DOCUMENT

In item 1 on page 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that a certified copy of the priority document has not been filed. It is respectfully submitted, however, that a certified copy of the priority document was filed on

Application No. 09/874,593
Response to Office Action

Customer No. 01933

September 27, 2001. A photocopy of the return receipt postcard evidencing USPTO receipt of the certified copy of the priority document is submitted herewith.

RE: THE INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

In item 2 on page 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that a copy of the reference (JP 11-252500) listed in the IDS filed on January 23, 2002, (mailed on November 27, 2001) was not supplied to the USPTO. It is respectfully submitted, however, that a copy of JP 11-252500 and an English language abstract thereof were submitted with the IDS filed on January 23, 2002, and were received by the USPTO, as evidenced by the photocopy of the return receipt postcard submitted herewith.

For the Examiner's convenience, another copy of JP 11-252500 and another copy of the English language abstract thereof are submitted herewith. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner consider JP 11-252500 (and the English language abstract thereof) and make it of record in the present application.

And it is respectfully requested that an initialed copy of the Form PTO/SB/08A submitted with the IDS filed on January 23, 2002, be returned to indicate that JP 11-252500 (and the English language abstract thereof) have been considered and made of record.

Application No. 09/874,593
Response to Office Action

Customer No. 01933

The IDS filed on January 23, 2002, fully complied with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.98 and was filed before the issuance of the first Office Action. Therefore, no fee is required for the consideration of JP 11-252500.

Nevertheless, authorization is hereby given to charge any necessary fees to Account No. 06-1378.

* * * * *

In view of the foregoing, entry of this Amendment, allowance of the claims and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas Holtz/

Douglas Holtz
Reg. No. 33,902

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.
220 Fifth Avenue - 16th Floor
New York, New York 10001-7708
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900
Fax No. (212) 319-5101

DH:iv
encs.